



TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834

COPY MAILED

JUL 13 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:
Motasim Sirhan et al.	: DECISION ON PETITIONS
Application No. 10/017,500	: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) AND
Filed: December 14, 2001	: UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)
Attorney Docket No. 020460-001000US	:

This is a decision on the second renewed petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), filed June 15, 2005, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed nonprovisional and provisional applications set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The second renewed petition is **GRANTED**.

A petition filed July 19, 2004 was dismissed August 30, 2004 because the amendment filed with the petition improperly incorporated by reference the prior filed applications. A renewed petition which still had not deleted the improper incorporation by reference statement from the amendment was filed September 20, 2004 and dismissed in a decision mailed May 15, 2005. Comes now petitioner with the second renewed petition deleting the improper incorporation by reference statement from the amendment filed.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant nonprovisional application was filed after November 29, 2000, and the claim herein for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications is submitted after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). Therefore, this is a proper petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6).

The instant nonprovisional application was pending at the time of filing of the reference to the prior-filed provisional application as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii). Additionally, the intermediate non-provisional applications were filed within twelve months of the filing date of the prior-filed provisional application, Application No. 60/258,924, which was filed on December 22, 2000.

The petition complies with the requirements for a grantable petition under 37 CFR §§1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) in that (1) a reference to the prior-filed applications has been included in an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title, as provided by 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(iii) and 1.78(a)(5)(iii); (2) the surcharge fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(t) has been submitted; and (3) the petition contains an adequate statement of unintentional delay. Accordingly, having found that the instant petition for acceptance of an unintentionally delayed claim for the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) to the prior-filed applications satisfies the conditions of 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), the petition is granted.

The granting of the petition to accept the delayed benefit claim to the prior-filed applications under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) should not be construed as meaning that the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the prior-filed applications. In order for the instant application to be entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed applications, all other requirements under 35 U.S.C. §§120 and 365(c) and 1.78(a)(1) and (a)(2) and under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(4) and (a)(5) must be met. Similarly, the fact that the corrected Filing Receipt accompanying this decision on petition includes the prior-filed applications should not be construed as meaning that applicant is entitled to the claim for benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications noted thereon. Accordingly, the examiner will, in due course, consider this benefit claim and determine whether the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date.

A corrected Filing Receipt, which includes the priority claim to the prior-filed applications, accompanies this decision on petition.

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Patricia Faison-Ball at (571) 272-3212. All other inquiries concerning either the examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

The application is being forwarded to Technology Center AU 3738 for appropriate action on the amendment submitted June 15, 2005, including consideration by the examiner of the claim under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Frances Hicks".

Frances Hicks
Lead Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy

ATTACHMENT : Corrected Filing Receipt